

S/N 09/748,345  
Hans A. Lichtfuss  
Atty Dkt 10002593-1

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 29, 31-34 and 37-54 were pending prior to this response. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 29, 31-34 and 37-54 remain pending unchanged. Reexamination and reconsideration are requested.

S/N 09/748,345  
Hans A. Lichtfuss  
Atty Dkt 10002593-1

**I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 29, 31-34, 37-40, 44, 45, 49 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 29, 31-34, 37-40, 44, 45, 49 and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sawanobori (U.S. 6,486,980). Reconsideration is requested.

**Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 39 and 40**

Applicant's claim 1 recites the following:

A device comprising:  
a frame;  
a lid movably attached to said frame, said lid being movable between a closed position and an open position;  
a display mounted to said lid;  
**a photosensor array movably mounted within said frame;**  
and  
wherein said display is visible when said lid is in said closed position.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is not anticipated by Sawanobori. In the Sawanobori device, an LCD unit 30 (e.g., Figs. 1-3) is movably mounted to a body 20. The LCD unit 30 includes a display 31. A scanner unit 40 is also movably mounted to the body 20. Thus, Sawanobori does not disclose or suggest a lid having a display movably mounted to a frame *and* a photosensor array movably mounted within the frame as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Sawanobori.

In response to the above argument, the Examiner points out (in

Page 3 of 6

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

S/N 09/748,345  
Hans A. Lichtfuss  
Atty Dkt 10002583-1

paragraph 2 of the final Office action) that Sawanbori discloses a modification in which the line sensor 41 may be moved relative to the photographic film "F". Sawanbori discusses this modification as follows:

In a modification, the line sensor 41 may be intermittently conveyed along the photographic film F while scanning the image on the photographic film F.

(col. 3, lines 60-62)

Sawanbori does generally mention a modification in which the line sensor 41 may be moved along the photographic film. Sawanbori does not, however, explain how this modification could be achieved and, specifically, where the line sensor 41 is to be located. Applicant's claim 1 recites "a photosensor array movably mounted within said frame". The Examiner takes the position that applicant's recited "frame" reads on the Sawanbori body 20 (see, e.g., final Office action, paragraph 4). Sawanbori clearly does not disclose or suggest that the line sensor 41 be located within the body 20 in order to achieve the modification discussed above. In fact, it would appear that the Sawanbori line sensor 41 could not be placed within the body 20 since the body 20 contains the back-light unit 22 and the line sensor 41 and back-light unit 22 must be located on opposite sides of the photographic film "F".

Accordingly, even considering the Sawanbori modification pointed out by the Examiner, applicant's claim 1 is clearly not anticipated by Sawanbori.

Claims 2, 4-6, 39 and 40 are allowable at least as ultimately depending from allowable base claim 1. Claim 28 has been canceled.

S/N 09/748,345  
Hans A. Lichtfuss  
Atty Dkt 10002593-1

Claims 29, 31-33, 44 and 45

Independent claim 29 recites "a photosensor array movably mounted within said frame". Accordingly, claim 29 is allowable for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 31-33, 44 and 45 are allowable at least as ultimately depending from allowable base claim 29.

Claims 34, 37, 38, 49 and 50

Independent claim 34 recites "a photosensor array movably mounted within said frame" and "moving said photosensor array within said frame". Accordingly, claim 34 is allowable for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 37, 38, 49 and 50 are allowable at least as ultimately depending from allowable base claim 34.

S/N 09/748,345  
Hans A. Lichtfuss  
Atty Dkt 10002593-1

**II. Rejection of Claims 41-43, 46-48 and 51-54 under 35 U.S.C.**

**§103(a)**

Claims 41-43, 46-48 and 51-54 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Sawanobori (U.S. 6,486,980) in view of Reele (U.S. 6,567,190).  
Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 41-43 are allowable at least as ultimately depending from allowable base claim 1.

Claims 46-48 are allowable at least as ultimately depending from allowable base claim 29.

Claims 51-54 are allowable at least as ultimately depending from allowable base claim 34.

For the reasons advanced above, applicant respectfully asserts that all of the claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,  
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.

By 

Michael A. Goodwin, Reg. No. 32,697  
KLAAS, LAW, O'MEARA & MALKIN, P.C.  
1999 Broadway, Suite 2225  
Denver, CO 80202  
Telephone: (303) 298-9888  
Fax: (303) 297-2266  
Date: July 28, 2005

Page 6 of 6

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**